
From: (b) (6) @nlrb.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, October 30, 2018 12:01 PM
To: (b) (6);
(b) (6);
(b) (6);
(b) (6);
Cc: (b) (6);
Subject: Petition response to ring PLEASE CIRCULATE
Attachments: PCA response to Ring.docx

Good afternoon stewards,

As you may recall, Chairman Ring sent an obnoxious email to Board staff a few weeks ago essentially (1) criticizing the PA leadership's stance in the upcoming contract negotiations, (2) condescendingly explaining the collective bargaining process to us (labor lawyers!), and (3) encouraging direct communication between himself and the Unit employees ("my door is open").

The PCA committee has been hard at work and drafted the attached letter to circulate among your offices for signatures, and then we will deliver this letter response to the Chairman. We are hoping that we can reach everyone this week. Full participation is our goal so that we send a clear, unified message to the Chairman. Please get your signed petitions completed ASAP but no later than **COB Friday, November 2.** This way we can deliver the signed letters to Ring before the ABA conference in San Francisco.

You can return the signed petitions to me (b) (6) or (b) (6)

If you would like help with getting office signatures, please lean on your office's PCA coordinators for help. But PLEASE be sure to complete signatures on one petition before starting to circulate another copy so we can fill up all the letters with signatures. For offices where we have PCA coordinators in addition to stewards:

(b) (6)

(b) (6)

(b) (6)

(b) (6)

(b) (6)

*Please note that (b) (6) will not be in the office Thursday or Friday.

In Solidarity,

(b) (6)

From: [Ring, John](#)
Cc: [Lucy, Christine B.](#); [Rice, Tresa](#); [Schreckengost, Lindsey A.](#)
Bcc: [ML-HQ-Board Chairman Ring](#); [ML-HQ-Board Member Emanuel](#); [ML-HQ-Board Member Kaplan](#); [ML-HQ-Board Member McFerran](#); [ML-HQ-Board Member Pearce](#); [ML-HQ-Executive Secretary](#); [ML-HQ-Representation Appeals](#); [ML-HQ-Solicitor's Office](#); [Witkin, Cynthia](#); [Roberts, Tracey](#)
Subject: Upcoming Negotiations
Date: Friday, October 12, 2018 9:57:00 AM



To: Board Side Staff

On August 8, 2018, I provided notice to the NLRBPA's leadership of the Board majority's desire to negotiate an updated collective bargaining agreement. Our current agreement was entered into in 2002. Rather than engage in regular rounds of bargaining over the years, our understanding is that the agreement was rolled over, along with various MOUs and side agreements executed as needed for the past 16 years.

For those of you who are members of the NLRBPA's bargaining unit, I'm sure your union will provide you with necessary information. However, I wanted to make sure you, along with the rest of the Board-side staff, heard directly from me regarding the subject of upcoming negotiations. As the primary federal agency dedicated to the advancement of collective bargaining, it seems extraordinary that the NLRB would not have negotiated an updated labor agreement for more than 16 years. Most of us have dedicated our professional lives to collective bargaining, and we understand the value and importance of periodic negotiations to address workplace issues and to keep labor agreements current.

I know there is speculation and even some concern among members of the bargaining unit about these negotiations. It's been so long since we have had a full round of bargaining, many of you may not have been at the Agency when the last agreement was bargained. Some of you may have never been through the process. Additionally, I know the recently-issued notices from the Agency last Friday to the NLRBPA are phrased as "terminations" of the agreement and call for cancelation of permissive subjects of bargaining. These types of notices are normal and should not be interpreted as anything other. As I have stated many times, the Board values each of you and recognizes your contribution and importance to the Agency. We intend to do nothing to undermine that commitment.

We all are stewards of this important Agency. We're here because we care about the NLRB's mission and about those the Act protects. As such, we all must be open-minded about how we might improve what we do under the circumstances we find ourselves, some of which are not under our control, including flat budgets and decreasing case loads. We will make proposals, some of which the union leadership may not like. They will make proposals, some of which we may not like. There will be a healthy exchange of ideas and proposals. That's the nature of collective bargaining, and if approached in good faith, with mutual respect and in a cooperative, positive spirit, I believe

there is a lot of good that can come out of this bargaining.

Based on everything I've seen since recently coming to the Agency, the attorneys and other professionals are incredibly committed to NLRB and its mission. Together, we can make the Agency better and a better place to work. As always, my door is open to anyone who has questions or concerns.

John F. Ring

Chairman

National Labor Relations Board

1015 Half Street SE Washington, DC 20570

john.ring@nrlb.gov | 202-273-2722

From: (b) (6)
To: (b) (6)
(b) (6)
(b) (6)
Cc: (b) (6)
Subject: appliance cleaning-
Date: Tuesday, October 30, 2018 4:05:00 PM

Stewards:

We understand that some managers are approaching shops to talk about cleaning the kitchen appliances now that they are not being taken care of by the cleaning staff. The Cost Savings Working Group bargaining committee recommends that shops tell managers – if asked – that the PA and individual shops **will not assist with creating a system for cleaning**. Management completely railroaded the PA on this matter. It canceled the contract unilaterally, claiming a dire financial situation. The Agency ended the year with a SIX MILLION DOLLAR surplus and received level funding this year, but has opted not to reinstate the \$57,000 annual cleaning contract (which, with \$6M it could have done 105 times). During bargaining, the Agency refused our proposals seeking cleaning supplies similar to those used by the cleaning company, and instead would only agree – after fighting with them for months – to provide dish soap and paper towels (like the ones in the bathroom). Given this background, it is the CSWG bargaining committee's strong recommendation that shop stewards tell managers that the PA tried to work with the Agency in bargaining despite the unilateral termination but was rebuffed repeatedly; and now management should figure out how to get the appliances cleaned. While employees cannot refuse a work assignment – which includes "other duties as assigned" and therefore appliance cleaning – we see no need to assist with this ridiculous assignment of work under the circumstances. Basically, management unilaterally created the problem, we think management should unilaterally fix it. We tried cooperative measures and they failed.

Thanks.

From: [Dreeben, Linda J.](#)
To: (b) (6)
Cc: (b) (6)
Subject: RE: Cleaning refrigerators and appliances
Date: Tuesday, October 30, 2018 4:06:36 PM

I appreciate your responding.
Linda

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Tuesday, October 30, 2018 3:54 PM
To: Dreeben, Linda J. <Linda.Dreeben@nrlb.gov>
Cc: (b) (6)@nrlb.gov
Subject: Cleaning refrigerators and appliances

Dear Linda,

I write in response to your query about whether the unit could propose ideas and/or participate in efforts to clean the kitchen appliances in our break rooms. As we discussed, since the Agency discontinued the portion of our cleaning contract pertaining to break-room appliances, some of the refrigerators used by our branch have gotten dirtier and have started to emit unpleasant smells. I've noticed that several microwaves have gotten dirtier as well.

I regret to say that the unit cannot be of assistance in this case. I am sure you know the reasons for our position, but they bear repeating nevertheless.

- The idea of cancelling appliance-cleaning services emerged from the Agency's Cost Savings Working Group, which included PA representatives, as a means to reduce expenses in the event Congress were to cut our operating budget.
- Despite the fact that those budgetary cuts never materialized for either FY18 or FY19, the Agency unilaterally implemented many of the Working Group's cost-saving measures, including the cancelling of appliance-cleaning services.
- When the Agency took that unilateral action, the PA sought to negotiate over its implementation. Among other proposals, the PA requested that the Agency provide cleaning products similar to those used by cleaning personnel in order to maintain the cleanliness of our breakroom appliances. The Agency refused to consider those proposals.
- Despite ending the fiscal year with a \$6 million surplus, the Agency has refused to reinstate the cleaning contract, which is only worth \$57,000 annually.

In short, the Agency unilaterally decided to cancel a relatively inexpensive service, and then obstinately refused to entertain the PA's suggestions to mitigate the—predicable—effects of that decision. Now that those effects are being felt by all, the PA is of the view that it is up to the Agency and its managers to resolve the problem the Agency created.

Sincerely,

(b) (6) (steward) on behalf (b) (6) (steward) and all ASCLB unit attorneys

From: (b) (6)
To: (b) (6)
Subject: RE: Cleaning Staff
Date: Tuesday, October 30, 2018 6:50:33 PM

Thanks, (b) (6) . There may be an ethical issue with a collection by the PA, but I don't think there's any prohibition on individual employees.

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Tuesday, October 30, 2018 6:40 PM
To: (b) (6) @nlrb.gov; (b) (6) @nlrb.gov; (b) (6) @nlrb.gov; (b) (6) @nlrb.gov; (b) (6) @nlrb.gov; (b) (6) @nlrb.gov; (b) (6) @nlrb.gov; (b) (6) @nlrb.gov; (b) (6) @nlrb.gov; (b) (6) @nlrb.gov
Subject: RE: Cleaning Staff

OK, thanks.

Speaking as someone who would also be very upset if good people lost their jobs over the building management's decision to contract with a new cleaning company, I am not certain that the PA has any leverage here whatsoever to effectuate a change. We would essentially be asking Ring to do the PA a personal favor and reach out to the new contractor (who has a contract with the building management, not the NLRB) about hiring employees who are not unit employees. They are not even agency contractors (and I believe bargaining about an agency's employment of contractors is a prohibited subject of bargaining – (b) (6) so it seems to me that Ring's power here would be pretty limited. I think the PA would be better off contacting the contractor itself rather than using Ring as our conduit – which would then raise the question of whether the PA would be willing to do so. I personally would be hesitant.

I guess long story short, I would support the PA gathering up money to help them through a job transition, but I'm not sure what else we can do here.

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Tuesday, October 30, 2018 6:35 PM
To: (b) (6) @nlrb.gov; (b) (6) @nlrb.gov; (b) (6) @nlrb.gov; (b) (6) @nlrb.gov; (b) (6) @nlrb.gov; (b) (6) @nlrb.gov; (b) (6) @nlrb.gov; (b) (6) @nlrb.gov; (b) (6) @nlrb.gov; (b) (6) @nlrb.gov
Subject: RE: Cleaning Staff

Basically, yes.

From: (b) (6)

Sent: Tuesday, October 30, 2018 6:34 PM

To: (b) (6) <[REDACTED]@nlrb.gov>; (b) (6) <[REDACTED]@nlrb.gov>; (b) (6) <[REDACTED]@nlrb.gov>; (b) (6) <[REDACTED]@nlrb.gov>; (b) (6) <[REDACTED]@nlrb.gov>; (b) (6) <[REDACTED]@nlrb.gov>; (b) (6) <[REDACTED]@nlrb.gov>; (b) (6) <[REDACTED]@nlrb.gov>; (b) (6) <[REDACTED]@nlrb.gov>

Subject: RE: Cleaning Staff

(b) (6) is your concern that the PA's involvement would be viewed as a bargaining position regarding the kitchen cleaning and other items we've discussed in CSWG bargaining?

From: (b) (6)

Sent: Tuesday, October 30, 2018 6:25 PM

To: (b) (6) <[REDACTED]@nlrb.gov>; (b) (6) <[REDACTED]@nlrb.gov>; (b) (6) <[REDACTED]@nlrb.gov>; (b) (6) <[REDACTED]@nlrb.gov>; (b) (6) <[REDACTED]@nlrb.gov>; (b) (6) <[REDACTED]@nlrb.gov>; (b) (6) <[REDACTED]@nlrb.gov>; (b) (6) <[REDACTED]@nlrb.gov>; (b) (6) <[REDACTED]@nlrb.gov>

Subject: FW: Cleaning Staff

I want to let you know about an issue that I started looking into last week by sharing the email thread below. It potentially relates to cost savings bargaining over cleaning. The long and short of it is that a group of employees asked me what the PA could do to encourage the Agency to keep the current cleaning crew ("work family") in light of word that they might be let go. In the meantime, I've learned from Jessica Graham that building management has indeed awarded the cleaning contract to a new company effective December 1. The new contractor might pick up some of the current employees. The current contractor will transfer members of the cleaning crew to other sites, but some will likely be laid off because the current contractor doesn't have enough sites/positions to accommodate everyone. In discussions with Jessica Graham, she expressed reluctance to intervene because building management has the right to bid contracts and the Agency shouldn't risk interference. I'm really fond of (b) (6), too, but I'm having second thoughts about the PA's becoming involved.

From: (b) (6)

Sent: Tuesday, October 30, 2018 4:21 PM

To: (b) (6) <[REDACTED]@nlrb.gov>; (b) (6) <[REDACTED]@nlrb.gov>; (b) (6) <[REDACTED]@nlrb.gov>; (b) (6) <[REDACTED]@nlrb.gov>; (b) (6) <[REDACTED]@nlrb.gov>; (b) (6) <[REDACTED]@nlrb.gov>; (b) (6) <[REDACTED]@nlrb.gov>; (b) (6) <[REDACTED]@nlrb.gov>; (b) (6) <[REDACTED]@nlrb.gov>

Subject: RE: Cleaning Staff

We might want to proceed with a small dose of caution given the reservations that Jessica voiced (which, frankly, were a surprise to me) and given (b) (6) email summarizing the PA's approach to cleaning at the bargaining table. It *might* be better for individuals a/o a small delegation to approach the Chairman and their front offices to avoid conflating the "work family" issue with bargaining issues.

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Tuesday, October 30, 2018 2:22 PM
To: (b) (6) <(b) (6)@nlrb.gov>; (b) (6) <(b) (6)@nlrb.gov>; (b) (6) <(b) (6)@nlrb.gov>; (b) (6) <(b) (6)@nlrb.gov>
Cc: (b) (6) <(b) (6)@nlrb.gov>; (b) (6) <(b) (6)@nlrb.gov>; (b) (6) <(b) (6)@nlrb.gov>
Subject: RE: Cleaning Staff

I like that idea (b) (6)

And not to jump ahead, but if we receive resistance or if the Chairman says it will not be possible, we can then start next steps on figuring out something we can do to properly thank them before they leave.

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Tuesday, October 30, 2018 1:58 PM
To: (b) (6) <(b) (6)@nlrb.gov>; (b) (6) <(b) (6)@nlrb.gov>; (b) (6) <(b) (6)@nlrb.gov>
Cc: (b) (6) <(b) (6)@nlrb.gov>; (b) (6) <(b) (6)@nlrb.gov>; (b) (6) <(b) (6)@nlrb.gov>; (b) (6) <(b) (6)@nlrb.gov>
Subject: RE: Cleaning Staff

Thanks (b) (6)

What I read from Jessica's email is that (a) some of the cleaning staff we know will continue working with their existing company (CRS, I think) in other buildings, (b) some will stay working here with Red Coats, Inc., and (c) some will be out of a job.

I guess what I recommend is that the PA write a letter to the (b) (6) telling (b) (6) how much we appreciate (b) (6) (and whoever else anyone thinks) and ask (b) (6) to let Red Coats know (through Jessica Graham) that the Agency would be grateful if Red Coats would attempt to retain those employees.

What do you all think?

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Tuesday, October 30, 2018 1:08 PM
To: (b) (6) <(b) (6)@nlrb.gov>; (b) (6) <(b) (6)@nlrb.gov>; (b) (6) <(b) (6)@nlrb.gov>
Cc: (b) (6) <(b) (6)@nlrb.gov>; (b) (6) <(b) (6)@nlrb.gov>; (b) (6) <(b) (6)@nlrb.gov>; (b) (6) <(b) (6)@nlrb.gov>
Subject: RE: Cleaning Staff

Jessica's response...

I just found out today that the new contract is with Red Coats Inc., effective December 1st. Some of the employees are staying with their existing company and will be placed add another job site. The employees that are willing to go with the new company are receiving offers. The existing company does not have enough positions at other job sites for everybody.

Jessica M. Graham
Director of Facilities and Property
National Labor Relations Board

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Tuesday, October 30, 2018 12:01 PM
To: (b) (6) <(b) (6)@nrlrb.gov>; (b) (6) <(b) (6)@nrlrb.gov>; (b) (6) <(b) (6)@nrlrb.gov>
Cc: (b) (6) <(b) (6)@nrlrb.gov>; (b) (6) <(b) (6)@nrlrb.gov>; (b) (6) <(b) (6)@nrlrb.gov>; (b) (6) <(b) (6)@nrlrb.gov>
Subject: RE: Cleaning Staff

Thanks!

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Tuesday, October 30, 2018 11:34 AM
To: (b) (6) <(b) (6)@nrlrb.gov>; (b) (6) <(b) (6)@nrlrb.gov>; (b) (6) <(b) (6)@nrlrb.gov>
Cc: (b) (6) <(b) (6)@nrlrb.gov>; (b) (6) <(b) (6)@nrlrb.gov>; (b) (6) <(b) (6)@nrlrb.gov>; (b) (6) <(b) (6)@nrlrb.gov>
Subject: RE: Cleaning Staff

Just wanted you to know that Jessica hasn't contacted me yet. I will "nudge" her today.

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Friday, October 26, 2018 10:15 AM
To: (b) (6) <(b) (6)@nrlrb.gov>; (b) (6) <(b) (6)@nrlrb.gov>; (b) (6) <(b) (6)@nrlrb.gov>
Cc: (b) (6) <(b) (6)@nrlrb.gov>; (b) (6) <(b) (6)@nrlrb.gov>; (b) (6) <(b) (6)@nrlrb.gov>; (b) (6) <(b) (6)@nrlrb.gov>
Subject: RE: Cleaning Staff

I'm adding (b) (6), who is also very concerned.

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Thursday, October 25, 2018 2:05 PM
To: (b) (6) <(b) (6)@nrlrb.gov>; (b) (6) <(b) (6)@nrlrb.gov>; (b) (6) <(b) (6)@nrlrb.gov>

(b) (6) @nlrb.gov>
Cc: (b) (6) @nlrb.gov>; (b) (6) @nlrb.gov>; (b) (6) @nlrb.gov>
Subject: RE: Cleaning Staff

Thanks.

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Thursday, October 25, 2018 1:55 PM
To: (b) (6) @nlrb.gov>; (b) (6) @nlrb.gov>; (b) (6) @nlrb.gov>
Cc: (b) (6) @nlrb.gov>; (b) (6) @nlrb.gov>; (b) (6) @nlrb.gov>
Subject: RE: Cleaning Staff

Also adding (b) (6) who is concerned as well.

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Thursday, October 25, 2018 12:50 PM
To: (b) (6) @nlrb.gov>; (b) (6) @nlrb.gov>; (b) (6) @nlrb.gov>
Cc: (b) (6) @nlrb.gov>; (b) (6) @nlrb.gov>
Subject: RE: Cleaning Staff

Jessica Graham doesn't have any answers. She said she will inquire whether building management has contracted with a new cleaning company and whether current employees will be picked up. She is loath to interfere in contractual matters that are strictly building management's business and will not intervene one way or the other regarding the current cleaning crew. She cautions us not to do so either. She did note that the current crew has already been vetted for security purposes. (However, in a town with so many federal agencies, most cleaning contractors probably have staff who've cleared the federal security process.) I will let you know when Jessica gets back to me.

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Thursday, October 25, 2018 12:20 PM
To: (b) (6) @nlrb.gov>; (b) (6) @nlrb.gov>; (b) (6) @nlrb.gov>
Cc: (b) (6) @nlrb.gov>; (b) (6) @nlrb.gov>
Subject: RE: Cleaning Staff

I don't have any further information to add, but I am concerned about all of this and hope we can do whatever possible to help protect or retain the existing cleaning employees.

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Thursday, October 25, 2018 11:33 AM

To: (b) (6) @nlrb.gov; (b) (6) @nlrb.gov
Cc: (b) (6) @nlrb.gov; (b) (6) @nlrb.gov; (b) (6) @nlrb.gov
Subject: RE: Cleaning Staff

Thanks very much for the (b) (6)

I'm not certain how the contract is structured. I've copied (b) (6) and (b) (6) here, who I think may know a little more about that. (b) (6) tells me that some of the cleaners may be retained, but they've received the message that whatever contractor comes in may not need as many employees. It's not clear when particular cleaners will be notified about their future at this building at this point.

Second, and less immediately, (b) (6) also asked about whether we can try to raise some money for those who are adversely affected by this change (if we aren't able to avert a bad outcome). We couldn't remember whether there had been some ethics concerns about that when we'd previously tried to raise money for (b) (6) family.

As far as next steps are concerned, I think once we know who has the contract, we can write a letter to the building, the agency, or both. But definitely open to other ideas that anyone may have.

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Wednesday, October 24, 2018 7:39 PM
To: (b) (6) @nlrb.gov; (b) (6) @nlrb.gov
Cc: (b) (6) @nlrb.gov
Subject: RE: Cleaning Staff

Thanks (b) (6) and, yes, (b) (6) (b) (6)

It sounds like maybe the building has the contract with cleaning company and not the Agency. Is that right? Whatever it is, I think it would be great if the Agency could convey to the relevant group that on the 5th floor (and maybe some of the other NLRB floors) we would very much like to keep our current cleaning staff, especially (b) (6), and maybe (b) (6) and whoever else people appreciate.

First, though, it would probably be good to confirm that there is, in fact, a plan to replace the cleaning crew. I assume the PA has a point of contact for those inquiries?

Anyhow, those are my 2 cents. I'd love to hear what you all think are the best next steps.

Best,

(b) (6)

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Wednesday, October 24, 2018 6:25 PM

To: (b) (6) @nlrb.gov; (b) (6) @nlrb.gov
Cc: (b) (6) @nlrb.gov
Subject: RE: Cleaning Staff

First things first: (b) (6) (b) (6)

I certainly have no objections to the PA's making this inquiry and I agree with you about our "work family." The last time we stepped in to help a contract employee, however, after a bit of wrangling, the Agency itself offered (b) (6) a job and (b) (6) declined. That was (b) (6) I suspect there's more going on here than we know. I saw (b) (6) on Monday and (b) (6) said the new tenants on the upper floors have been complaining about the cleaning staff and that the mere presence of new tenants added tremendously to the cleaning crew's work load. It could be that the current contractor doesn't have a large enough employee complement to meet all tenants' demands and/or that building management's decision was informed by the complaints. To reiterate, though, I'm okay with raising the question.

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Wednesday, October 24, 2018 2:42 PM
To: (b) (6) @nlrb.gov; (b) (6) @nlrb.gov
Cc: (b) (6) @nlrb.gov
Subject: RE: Cleaning Staff

Thanks so much for letting us know, (b) (6) . I hadn't heard this news. I am definitely on call to help with a potential response, too.

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Wednesday, October 24, 2018 2:41 PM
To: (b) (6) @nlrb.gov
Cc: (b) (6) @nlrb.gov
Subject: Cleaning Staff

H (b) (6)

I heard today that the Agency is ending the contract with our current cleaning company as of Thanksgiving. I don't know any of the details, but if it's true, I'm wondering if the PA could request that the Agency at least ask the new company to retain the employees that have been so good to us on the 5th floor. (b) (6) go above and beyond their duties in keeping this floor clean, not to mention that for many of us they have become part of our work family.

I am happy to help draft a letter or email if that would help.

Best,

(b) (6)

From: (b) (6)
To: (b) (6)
Subject: RE: hardball on the cleaning!
Date: Tuesday, October 30, 2018 4:44:04 PM

(b) (6) has volunteered to do it for a cool \$40k.

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Tuesday, October 30, 2018 4:18 PM
To: (b) (6) @nlrb.gov>
Subject: RE: hardball on the cleaning!

How POWERFUL are we?? I mean, really sticking it to the man. Some people strike over a living wage. We FIGHT TO THE DEATH over refrigerator cleaning

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Tuesday, October 30, 2018 4:17 PM
To: (b) (6) @nlrb.gov>
Subject: hardball on the cleaning!

I love it! I will be coming in tomorrow so see you then—good luck at your moot!

From: (b) (6)
To: (b) (6)
Subject: RE: appliance cleaning email
Date: Tuesday, October 30, 2018 3:31:02 PM

Hey, here's my (longer-winded) message to Linda. Feel free to tinker/slash/etc.

I was wondering if I should cc the unit when I send it to her, or if that's a jerk move?

Dear Linda,

I write in response to your query about whether the unit could propose ideas and/or participate in efforts to clean the kitchen appliances in our break rooms. As we discussed, since the Agency discontinued the portion of our cleaning contract pertaining to break-room appliances, some of the refrigerators used by our branch have gotten dirtier and have started to emit unpleasant smells. I've noticed that several microwaves have gotten dirtier as well.

I am sorry to say that the unit cannot be of assistance in this case. I am sure you know the reasons for our position, but they bear repeating nevertheless.

- The idea of cancelling appliance-cleaning services emerged from the Cost Savings Working Group set up by the PA and the Agency, as a means to reduce expenses in the event Congress were to cut our operating budget.
- Despite the fact that those budgetary cuts have so far not materialized, the Agency has unilaterally implemented several of the committee's cost-saving measures, including the cancelling of appliance-cleaning services.
- When the Agency took that unilateral action, the PA sought to negotiate over its implementation; in particular, the PA requested that the Agency provide cleaning products similar to those used by cleaning personnel, or even minimal cleaning supplies, in order to maintain the cleanliness of our breakroom appliances. The Agency refused to consider any of the PA's proposals.
- Despite ending the fiscal year with a \$6 million surplus, the Agency has refused to reinstate a cleaning contract worth \$57,000.

In short, the Agency unilaterally decided to cancel a relatively inexpensive service, and then obstinately refused to entertain the PA's suggestions to mitigate the—predicable—effects of that decision. Now that those effects are being felt by all, the PA is of the view that it is up to the Agency and its managers to unilaterally find a solution.

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Tuesday, October 30, 2018 2:50 PM
To: (b) (6) @nlrb.gov>
Subject: FW: appliance cleaning email

This is under review right now -but gives you my immediate thoughts

From: (b) (6)

Sent: Tuesday, October 30, 2018 2:44 PM

To: (b) (6) <[@nrlrb.gov](mailto:(b) (6)@nrlrb.gov)>; (b) (6) <[@nrlrb.gov](mailto:(b) (6)@nrlrb.gov)>; (b) (6)

(b) (6) <[@nrlrb.gov](mailto:(b) (6)@nrlrb.gov)>; (b) (6) <[@nrlrb.gov](mailto:(b) (6)@nrlrb.gov)>; (b) (6)

(b) (6) <[@nrlrb.gov](mailto:(b) (6)@nrlrb.gov)>

Subject: appliance cleaning email

Email draft below should be self-explanatory. ASCLB and Appeals are approaching stewards to come up with an appliance cleaning system. I think we should respond per my email below.

Stewards,

We understand that some managers are approaching shops to talk about cleaning the kitchen appliances now that they are not being taken care of by the cleaning staff. The Cost Savings Working Group bargaining committee recommends that shops tell managers that they will not work to create a system for cleaning. Management completely railroaded the PA on this matter. It canceled the contract unilaterally, claiming dire financial situation. For reference, the Agency ended the year with a SIX MILLION DOLLAR surplus, but has not reinstated the \$57,000 cleaning contract (which it could have done 105 times). During bargaining, the Agency refused to agree to our proposals to provide the most minimal cleaning supplies. Given this background, it is the bargaining committee's strong recommendation that shop stewards tell management that the unit tried to work with management in bargaining but was rebuffed repeatedly; and now management should figure out how get the appliances cleaned. While employees cannot refuse a work assignment – which includes “other duties as assigned” and therefore appliance cleaning – we see no need to assist with this ridiculous assignment of work under the circumstances. Basically, management unilaterally created the problem, we think management should unilaterally fix it. We tried cooperative measures and they failed.

From: (b) (6)
To: (b) (6)
Subject: RE: appliance cleaning email
Date: Tuesday, October 30, 2018 3:15:47 PM

(b) (6) correct my suggested correction if I am wrong.

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Tuesday, October 30, 2018 2:40 PM
To: (b) (6) @nlrb.gov; (b) (6) @nlrb.gov; (b) (6) @nlrb.gov; (b) (6) @nlrb.gov; (b) (6) @nlrb.gov; (b) (6) @nlrb.gov
Subject: appliance cleaning email

Email draft below should be self-explanatory. ASCLB and Appeals are approaching stewards to come up with an appliance cleaning system. I think we should respond per my email below.

Stewards,

We understand that some managers are approaching shops to talk about cleaning the kitchen appliances now that they are not being taken care of by the cleaning staff. The Cost Savings Working Group bargaining committee recommends that shops tell managers that they will not work to create a system for cleaning. Management completely railroaded the PA on this matter. It canceled the contract unilaterally, claiming dire financial situation. For reference, the Agency ended the year with a SIX MILLION DOLLAR surplus, but has not reinstated the \$57,000 cleaning contract (which it could have done 105 times). During bargaining, the Agency refused to ~~agree to our proposals to provide the most minimal cleaning supplies~~ **supply anything more than paper towels and dish detergent for appliance cleaning, including refrigerators**. Given this background, it is the bargaining committee's strong recommendation that shop stewards tell management that the unit tried to work with management in bargaining but was rebuffed repeatedly; and now management should figure out how get the appliances cleaned. While employees cannot refuse a work assignment – which includes "other duties as assigned" and therefore appliance cleaning – we see no need to assist with this ridiculous assignment of work under the circumstances. Basically, management unilaterally created the problem, we think management should unilaterally fix it. We tried cooperative measures and they failed.

From: (b) (6)
To: (b) (6)
Subject: RE: appliance cleaning email
Date: Tuesday, October 30, 2018 3:08:05 PM

Agreed. If the managers want a system, they can figure it out.

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Tuesday, October 30, 2018 2:45 PM
To: (b) (6) @nlrb.gov; (b) (6) @nlrb.gov; (b) (6) @nlrb.gov; (b) (6) @nlrb.gov; (b) (6) @nlrb.gov
Subject: RE: appliance cleaning email

I agree. Draft email looks good.

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Tuesday, October 30, 2018 2:42 PM
To: (b) (6) @nlrb.gov; (b) (6) @nlrb.gov; (b) (6) @nlrb.gov; (b) (6) @nlrb.gov; (b) (6) @nlrb.gov
Subject: RE: appliance cleaning email

As do I.

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Tuesday, October 30, 2018 2:41 PM
To: (b) (6) @nlrb.gov; (b) (6) @nlrb.gov; (b) (6) @nlrb.gov; (b) (6) @nlrb.gov; (b) (6) @nlrb.gov
Subject: RE: appliance cleaning email

I agree.....and even works as PCA

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Tuesday, October 30, 2018 2:40 PM
To: (b) (6) @nlrb.gov; (b) (6) @nlrb.gov; (b) (6) @nlrb.gov; (b) (6) @nlrb.gov; (b) (6) @nlrb.gov
Subject: appliance cleaning email

Email draft below should be self-explanatory. ASCLB and Appeals are approaching stewards to come up with an appliance cleaning system. I think we should respond per my email below.

Stewards,

We understand that some managers are approaching shops to talk about cleaning the kitchen appliances now that they are not being taken care of by the cleaning staff. The Cost Savings Working Group bargaining committee recommends that shops tell managers that they will not work to create a system for cleaning. Management completely railroaded the PA on this matter. It canceled the contract unilaterally, claiming dire financial situation. For reference, the Agency ended the year with a SIX MILLION DOLLAR surplus, but has not reinstated the \$57,000 cleaning contract (which it could have done 105 times). During bargaining, the Agency refused to agree to our proposals to provide the most minimal cleaning supplies. Given this background, it is the bargaining committee's strong recommendation that shop stewards tell management that the unit tried to work with management in bargaining but was rebuffed repeatedly; and now management should figure out how get the appliances cleaned. While employees cannot refuse a work assignment – which includes "other duties as assigned" and therefore appliance cleaning – we see no need to assist with this ridiculous assignment of work under the circumstances. Basically, management unilaterally created the problem, we think management should unilaterally fix it. We tried cooperative measures and they failed.

From: (b) (6)
To: (b) (6)
Subject: RE: appliance cleaning email
Date: Tuesday, October 30, 2018 2:51:19 PM

Thanks!

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Tuesday, October 30, 2018 2:50 PM
To: (b) (6) @nlrb.gov>
Subject: FW: appliance cleaning email

This is under review right now -but gives you my immediate thoughts

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Tuesday, October 30, 2018 2:44 PM
To: (b) (6) @nlrb.gov>; (b) (6) @nlrb.gov>; (b) (6) @nlrb.gov>; (b) (6) @nlrb.gov>; (b) (6) @nlrb.gov>
Subject: appliance cleaning email

Email draft below should be self-explanatory. ASCLB and Appeals are approaching stewards to come up with an appliance cleaning system. I think we should respond per my email below.

Stewards,

We understand that some managers are approaching shops to talk about cleaning the kitchen appliances now that they are not being taken care of by the cleaning staff. The Cost Savings Working Group bargaining committee recommends that shops tell managers that they will not work to create a system for cleaning. Management completely railroaded the PA on this matter. It canceled the contract unilaterally, claiming dire financial situation. For reference, the Agency ended the year with a SIX MILLION DOLLAR surplus, but has not reinstated the \$57,000 cleaning contract (which it could have done 105 times). During bargaining, the Agency refused to agree to our proposals to provide the most minimal cleaning supplies. Given this background, it is the bargaining committee's strong recommendation that shop stewards tell management that the unit tried to work with management in bargaining but was rebuffed repeatedly; and now management should figure out how get the appliances cleaned. While employees cannot refuse a work assignment – which includes “other duties as assigned” and therefore appliance cleaning – we see no need to assist with this ridiculous assignment of work under the circumstances. Basically, management unilaterally created the problem, we think management should unilaterally fix it. We tried cooperative measures and they failed.

From: (b) (6)
To: (b) (6)
Subject: RE: appliance cleaning email
Date: Tuesday, October 30, 2018 2:45:23 PM

I agree. Draft email looks good.

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Tuesday, October 30, 2018 2:42 PM
To: (b) (6) @nlrb.gov; (b) (6) @nlrb.gov;
(b) (6) @nlrb.gov; (b) (6) @nlrb.gov; (b) (6)
(b) (6) @nlrb.gov
Subject: RE: appliance cleaning email

As do I.

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Tuesday, October 30, 2018 2:41 PM
To: (b) (6) @nlrb.gov; (b) (6) @nlrb.gov; (b) (6)
(b) (6) @nlrb.gov; (b) (6) @nlrb.gov; (b) (6)
(b) (6) @nlrb.gov
Subject: RE: appliance cleaning email

I agree.....and even works as PCA

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Tuesday, October 30, 2018 2:40 PM
To: (b) (6) @nlrb.gov; (b) (6) @nlrb.gov; (b) (6)
(b) (6) @nlrb.gov; (b) (6) @nlrb.gov; (b) (6)
(b) (6) @nlrb.gov
Subject: appliance cleaning email

Email draft below should be self-explanatory. ASCLB and Appeals are approaching stewards to come up with an appliance cleaning system. I think we should respond per my email below.

Stewards,

We understand that some managers are approaching shops to talk about cleaning the kitchen appliances now that they are not being taken care of by the cleaning staff. The Cost Savings Working Group bargaining committee recommends that shops tell managers that they will not work to create a system for cleaning. Management completely railroaded the PA on this matter. It canceled the contract unilaterally, claiming dire financial situation. For reference, the Agency ended the year with a SIX MILLION DOLLAR surplus, but has not reinstated the \$57,000 cleaning contract (which it could have done 105 times). During bargaining, the Agency refused to agree to our proposals to provide

the most minimal cleaning supplies. Given this background, it is the bargaining committee's strong recommendation that shop stewards tell management that the unit tried to work with management in bargaining but was rebuffed repeatedly; and now management should figure out how get the appliances cleaned. While employees cannot refuse a work assignment – which includes “other duties as assigned” and therefore appliance cleaning – we see no need to assist with this ridiculous assignment of work under the circumstances. Basically, management unilaterally created the problem, we think management should unilaterally fix it. We tried cooperative measures and they failed.

From: (b) (6)
To: (b) (6)
Subject: RE: appliance cleaning email
Date: Tuesday, October 30, 2018 3:42:11 PM

Great, thanks. Hope it wasn't too much.

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Tuesday, October 30, 2018 3:41 PM
To: (b) (6) @nlrb.gov>
Subject: RE: appliance cleaning email

Super small changes below-

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Tuesday, October 30, 2018 3:31 PM
To: (b) (6) @nlrb.gov>
Subject: RE: appliance cleaning email

Hey, here's my (longer-winded) message to Linda. Feel free to tinker/slash/etc.

I was wondering if I should cc the unit when I send it to her, or if that's a jerk move? I'd probably not cc: the unit. I'd let her know that the shop's views will be conveyed to the unit, but not cc them on this email

Dear Linda,

I write in response to your query about whether the unit could propose ideas and/or participate in efforts to clean the kitchen appliances in our break rooms. As we discussed, since the Agency discontinued the portion of our cleaning contract pertaining to break-room appliances, some of the refrigerators used by our branch have gotten dirtier and have started to emit unpleasant smells. I've noticed that several microwaves have gotten dirtier as well.

I am sorry to say that the unit cannot be of assistance in this case. I am sure you know the reasons for our position, but they bear repeating nevertheless.

- The idea of cancelling appliance-cleaning services emerged from the Cost Savings Working Group set up by the PA and the Agency (unit reps were invited to participate) as a means to reduce expenses in the event Congress were to cut our operating budget.
- Despite the fact that those budgetary cuts have so far not never materialized for either FY18 or FY19, the Agency has unilaterally implemented several many of the committee's cost-saving measures, including the cancelling of appliance-cleaning services.
- When the Agency took that unilateral action, the PA sought to negotiate over its implementation; in particular, the PA requested that the Agency provide cleaning products

similar to those used by cleaning personnel, ~~among other proposals or even minimal cleaning supplies~~, in order to maintain the cleanliness of our breakroom appliances. The Agency refused to consider ~~any of the PA's those~~ proposals.

- Despite ending the fiscal year with a \$6 million surplus, the Agency has refused to reinstate ~~the annual~~ cleaning contract worth \$57,000.

In short, the Agency unilaterally decided to cancel a relatively inexpensive service, and then obstinately refused to entertain the PA's suggestions to mitigate the—predicable—effects of that decision. Now that those effects are being felt by all, the PA is of the view that it is up to the Agency and its managers to unilaterally find a solution.

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Tuesday, October 30, 2018 2:50 PM
To: (b) (6) <[@nrlrb.gov](mailto:(b) (6)@nrlrb.gov)>
Subject: FW: appliance cleaning email

This is under review right now -but gives you my immediate thoughts

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Tuesday, October 30, 2018 2:44 PM
To: (b) (6) <[@nrlrb.gov](mailto:(b) (6)@nrlrb.gov)>; (b) (6) <[@nrlrb.gov](mailto:(b) (6)@nrlrb.gov)>; (b) (6) <[@nrlrb.gov](mailto:(b) (6)@nrlrb.gov)>; (b) (6) <[@nrlrb.gov](mailto:(b) (6)@nrlrb.gov)>; (b) (6) <[@nrlrb.gov](mailto:(b) (6)@nrlrb.gov)>
Subject: appliance cleaning email

Email draft below should be self-explanatory. ASCLB and Appeals are approaching stewards to come up with an appliance cleaning system. I think we should respond per my email below.

Stewards,

We understand that some managers are approaching shops to talk about cleaning the kitchen appliances now that they are not being taken care of by the cleaning staff. The Cost Savings Working Group bargaining committee recommends that shops tell managers that they will not work to create a system for cleaning. Management completely railroaded the PA on this matter. It canceled the contract unilaterally, claiming dire financial situation. For reference, the Agency ended the year with a SIX MILLION DOLLAR surplus, but has not reinstated the \$57,000 cleaning contract (which it could have done 105 times). During bargaining, the Agency refused to agree to our proposals to provide the most minimal cleaning supplies. Given this background, it is the bargaining committee's strong recommendation that shop stewards tell management that the unit tried to work with management in bargaining but was rebuffed repeatedly; and now management should figure out how get the appliances cleaned. While employees cannot refuse a work assignment – which includes “other duties as assigned” and therefore appliance cleaning – we see no need to assist with this ridiculous assignment of work under the circumstances. Basically, management unilaterally created the

problem, we think management should unilaterally fix it. We tried cooperative measures and they failed.

From: (b) (6)
To: (b) (6)
Subject: RE: Cleaning refrigerators and appliances
Date: Tuesday, October 30, 2018 4:19:00 PM

Thanks – (b) (6) drafted

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Tuesday, October 30, 2018 4:14 PM
To: (b) (6) @nlrb.gov>
Cc: (b) (6) @nlrb.gov>
Subject: RE: Cleaning refrigerators and appliances

Fantastic message. Seriously.

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Tuesday, October 30, 2018 4:10 PM
To: (b) (6) @nlrb.gov>; (b) (6) @nlrb.gov>;
(b) (6) @nlrb.gov>; (b) (6) @nlrb.gov>; (b) (6)
(b) (6) @nlrb.gov>; (b) (6) @nlrb.gov>; (b) (6)
(b) (6) @nlrb.gov>; (b) (6) @nlrb.gov>; (b) (6)
(b) (6) @nlrb.gov>; (b) (6) @nlrb.gov>; (b) (6)
(b) (6) @nlrb.gov>; (b) (6) @nlrb.gov>; (b) (6)
(b) (6) @nlrb.gov>; (b) (6) @nlrb.gov>; (b) (6)
(b) (6) @nlrb.gov>

Subject: FW: Cleaning refrigerators and appliances

ASCLuB'ers:

See (b) (6) email below to Linda. The Cost Savings Working Group bargaining c'ee (consisting of elected officers, including yours truly) has recommended that we not participate in the charade of doing a volunteer schedule for appliance cleaning. The Agency has the authority and the money to make this problem go away. In fact, with a \$6m surplus, they could have made it go away 105x in a single fiscal year. We realize it's not awesome to have smelly microwaves and fridges, but you have our recommendation regardless.

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Tuesday, October 30, 2018 3:54 PM
To: Dreeben, Linda J. <Linda.Dreeben@nlrb.gov>
Cc: (b) (6) @nlrb.gov>
Subject: Cleaning refrigerators and appliances

Dear Linda,

I write in response to your query about whether the unit could propose ideas and/or participate in efforts to clean the kitchen appliances in our break rooms. As we discussed, since the Agency

discontinued the portion of our cleaning contract pertaining to break-room appliances, some of the refrigerators used by our branch have gotten dirtier and have started to emit unpleasant smells. I've noticed that several microwaves have gotten dirtier as well.

I regret to say that the unit cannot be of assistance in this case. I am sure you know the reasons for our position, but they bear repeating nevertheless.

- The idea of cancelling appliance-cleaning services emerged from the Agency's Cost Savings Working Group, which included PA representatives, as a means to reduce expenses in the event Congress were to cut our operating budget.
- Despite the fact that those budgetary cuts never materialized for either FY18 or FY19, the Agency unilaterally implemented many of the Working Group's cost-saving measures, including the cancelling of appliance-cleaning services.
- When the Agency took that unilateral action, the PA sought to negotiate over its implementation. Among other proposals, the PA requested that the Agency provide cleaning products similar to those used by cleaning personnel in order to maintain the cleanliness of our breakroom appliances. The Agency refused to consider those proposals.
- Despite ending the fiscal year with a \$6 million surplus, the Agency has refused to reinstate the cleaning contract, which is only worth \$57,000 annually.

In short, the Agency unilaterally decided to cancel a relatively inexpensive service, and then obstinately refused to entertain the PA's suggestions to mitigate the—predicable—effects of that decision. Now that those effects are being felt by all, the PA is of the view that it is up to the Agency and its managers to resolve the problem the Agency created.

Sincerely,

(b) (6) (steward) on behalf (b) (6) (steward) and all ASCLB unit attorneys

From: (b) (6)
To: (b) (6)
Subject: RE: Cleaning refrigerators and appliances
Date: Tuesday, October 30, 2018 4:07:27 PM

OK

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Tuesday, October 30, 2018 4:05 PM
To: (b) (6) @nlrb.gov>
Subject: FW: Cleaning refrigerators and appliances

I'll forward to ASCLB-

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Tuesday, October 30, 2018 3:54 PM
To: Dreeben, Linda J. <Linda.Dreeben@nlrb.gov>
Cc: (b) (6) @nlrb.gov>
Subject: Cleaning refrigerators and appliances

Dear Linda,

I write in response to your query about whether the unit could propose ideas and/or participate in efforts to clean the kitchen appliances in our break rooms. As we discussed, since the Agency discontinued the portion of our cleaning contract pertaining to break-room appliances, some of the refrigerators used by our branch have gotten dirtier and have started to emit unpleasant smells. I've noticed that several microwaves have gotten dirtier as well.

I regret to say that the unit cannot be of assistance in this case. I am sure you know the reasons for our position, but they bear repeating nevertheless.

- The idea of cancelling appliance-cleaning services emerged from the Agency's Cost Savings Working Group, which included PA representatives, as a means to reduce expenses in the event Congress were to cut our operating budget.
- Despite the fact that those budgetary cuts never materialized for either FY18 or FY19, the Agency unilaterally implemented many of the Working Group's cost-saving measures, including the cancelling of appliance-cleaning services.
- When the Agency took that unilateral action, the PA sought to negotiate over its implementation. Among other proposals, the PA requested that the Agency provide cleaning products similar to those used by cleaning personnel in order to maintain the cleanliness of our breakroom appliances. The Agency refused to consider those proposals.
- Despite ending the fiscal year with a \$6 million surplus, the Agency has refused to reinstate the cleaning contract, which is only worth \$57,000 annually.

In short, the Agency unilaterally decided to cancel a relatively inexpensive service, and then obstinately refused to entertain the PA's suggestions to mitigate the—predicable—effects of that decision. Now that those effects are being felt by all, the PA is of the view that it is up to the Agency and its managers to resolve the problem the Agency created.

Sincerely,

(b) (6) (steward) on behalf (b) (6) (steward) and all ASCLB unit attorneys